arXiv:1412.3067v2 [math.CO] 1 Jan 2015

COVERS IN PARTITIONED INTERSECTING HYPERGRAPHS

RON AHARONI AND C.J. ARGUE

Abstract. Given an integer r and a vector $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)$ of positive numbers with $\sum_{i\leqslant p} a_i = r$, an r-uniform hypergraph H is said to be $\vec{a}$-*partitioned* if $V(H) = \bigcup_{i\leqslant p} V_i$, where the sets V_i are disjoint, and $|e \cap V_i| = a_i$ for all $e \in H,\ i \leqslant p$. A $\vec{1}$-partitioned hypergraph is said to be r-*partite*. Let $t(\vec{a})$ be the maximum, over all intersecting $\vec{a}$-partitioned hypergraphs H, of the minimal size of a cover of H. A famous conjecture of Ryser is that $t(\vec{1}) \leqslant r-1$. Tuza [9] conjectured that if $r > 2$ then $t(\vec{a}) = r$ for every two components vector $\vec{a} = (a, b)$. We prove this conjecture whenever $a \neq b$, and also for $\vec{a} = (2, 2)$ and $\vec{a} = (4, 4)$.

1. Introduction

An r-*graph* is an r-uniform hypergraph, namely a set of sets called *edges*, all of size r. For a hypergraph H we denote by $\nu(H)$ the largest size of a matching (set of disjoint edges) in H, and by $\tau(H)$ the minimal size of a cover (a set of vertices meeting all edges). Since the union of all edges in a maximal matching is a cover, in an r-graph $\tau \leqslant r\nu$. Ryser conjectured that in r-partite hypregraphs $\tau \leqslant (r-1)\nu$. The conjecture appeared in a Ph.D thesis of his student, Henderson. At about the same time Lovász [8] made the stronger conjecture that in a non-empty r-partite hypergraph H there exists a set S of $r-1$ vertices such that $\nu(H-S) \leqslant \nu(H)-1$. The case $r = 2$ of Ryser's conjecture is König's theorem [7]. The conjecture was proved for $r = 3$ in [2]. The Lovász version is open even in this case. The fractional version, $\tau^* \leqslant (r-1)\nu$, is a corollary of a famous theorem of Füredi [5].

Of particular interest is the case $\nu = 1$, namely that of intersecting hypergraphs. As defined in the abstract, given a vector $\vec{a} = (a_1, \ldots, a_p)$ of positive numbers with $\sum_{i\leqslant p} a_i = r$, an r-uniform hypergraph H is said to be $\vec{a}$-*partitioned* if $V(H) = \bigcup_{i\leqslant p} V_i$, where the sets V_i are disjoint, and $|e \cap V_i| = a_i$ for all $e \in H,\ i \leqslant p$. We denote by $t(\vec{a})$ the maximum of $\tau(H)$ over all $\vec{a}$-partitioned intersecting hypergraphs. (Using a common abbreviated notation, we shall write $t(a_1, \ldots, a_m)$ for $t((a_1, \ldots, a_m))$.) So, the $\nu = 1$ case of Ryser's conjecture is that $t(\vec{1}) \leqslant r-1$. This is known to be sharp for r for which there exists an r-uniform projective plane. In [1, 3] the conjecture was shown to be sharp also for the first value of r for which an r-uniform projective plane does not exist, namely $r = 7$. It is plausible that the conjecture is sharp for all r.

A natural question is whether weaker conditions than r-partiteness suffice to guarantee $\tau \leqslant r-1$. In the fractional case, this is indeed true: by Füredi's theorem $\tau^* \leqslant (r-1)\nu$ for all $\vec{a}$-partitioned hypergraphs, for every non-trivial partitioning $\vec{a}$ of r. But it is likely that $t(\vec{a}) = r-1$ is quite rare. In [9] the following was suggested:

Conjecture 1.1. *If $r > 2$ then $t(\vec{a}) = r$ for all two-components vectors $\vec{a}$.*

Our main result is:

Theorem 1.2. *If $a \neq b$ then $t(a, b) = a + b$.*

2. Proof of Theorem 1.2

Let $m \geqslant 2$. A family $(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m)$ of a-graphs is called *cross intersecting* if any two edges e, f taken from distinct H_is have nonempty intersection. If all H_i are a-uniform, then this implies

(1) $\tau(H_i) \leqslant a$ (any edge from $H_j,\ j \neq i$ is a cover for H_i)

(2) $\tau\left(\bigcup_{i\leqslant m} H_i\right) \leqslant 2a-1$ (the union of two edges, taken from distinct H_is, is a cover for $\bigcup_{i\leqslant m} H_i$.)

If $\tau(H_i) = a$ for all $i \leqslant m$ and $\tau\left(\bigcup_{i\leqslant m} H_i\right) = 2a-1$ then the family is called *evasive*.

The research of the first author was supported by BSF grant no. 2006099, by an ISF grant and by the Discount Bank Chair at the Technion.

Observation 2.1. *If $(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m)$ (where $m \geqslant 2$) is an evasive system of cross intersecting a-graphs then $\tau(H_i) = a$ for all $i \leqslant m$.*

The reason - if there exists a cover C of H_i of size smaller than a, then for any edge $e \in H_i$ the set $C \cup e$ is a cover of size smaller than $2a - 1$.

Lemma 2.2.

(1) *For every a there exists an evasive cross intersecting family of three a-graphs.*
(2) *If $a = p^s$ for some prime p and integer s then there exists an evasive cross intersecting family of $a + 1$ a-graphs.*

Proof. (1) Consider the set of vertices $V = \{v_{ij} : 1 \leqslant i, j \leqslant a\}$. Let H_1 be the matching consisting of the rows of this grid, namely the edges of H_1 are $R_i := \{v_{ij} \mid j \leqslant a\}$, and let H_2 be the matching consisting of the columns of the grid, namely its edges are $C_j := \{v_{ij} \mid i \leqslant a\}$. Let H_3 be the set of all edges of the form $e_\sigma = \{v_{i,\sigma(i)} : 1 \leqslant i \leqslant a\}$ where σ is a permutation of $[a]$.

Clearly, (H_1, H_2, H_3) is cross-intersecting. To show evasiveness, consider a cover C of $H_1 \cup H_2 \cup H_3$. Since C covers H_3, by Hall's theorem there are sets $S, T \subseteq [a]$ such that $M := \{v_{s,t} : s \in S, t \in T\} \subseteq C$ and $|S| + |T| > a$. Let $d = \min(|S|, |T|)$. Since C covers $H_1 \cup H_2$, we have $|C \setminus M| \geqslant a - d$. thus $|C| \geqslant |S| \cdot |T| + d = a(a - d) + (a - d) = a(a - d + 1)$, and since $a - d + 1 \geqslant 2$ we have $|C| \geqslant 2a - 1$, as required.

(2) In this case there exists an $a+1$-uniform Desarguian projective plane (the projective plane ordinarily constructed, using vector spaces, is Desarguian). Take a line $v_1 v_2 \ldots v_{a+1}$ in this plane, and let H_i ($i \leqslant a + 1$) be the sets of edges containing v_i, with v_i deleted. The system of H_is thus obtained is called an *affine plane*, in this case - a Desarguian affine plane. Clearly, the system $(H_1, \ldots, H_{a+1})$ is cross intersecting. A well known result of Jamison, Brower and Schrijver [4, 6] states that it is also evasive. □

Lemma 2.3.

Let F be any intersecting b-graph with $\tau(F) = b$. If there exists an evasive cross intersecting family $(H_1, H_2, \ldots, H_m)$ of a-graphs, and $\frac{a}{m-1} \leqslant b < a$, then there exists an (a, b)-partitioned $a + b$-graph G in which the b-side consists of m disjoint copies of F, and $\tau(G) = a + b$.

Proof. Let $F_1, \ldots, F_m$ be m disjoint copies of F. Define $G = \{h \cup f : h \in H_i, f \in F_i, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant m\}$. Clearly, G is intersecting and is (a, b)-partitioned. We shall show that $\tau(G) = a + b$. Let C be a cover of G. If C covers all H_i then by the evasiveness property $|C| \geqslant 2a - 1 \geqslant a + b$. For every $i \leqslant m$, if C does not cover H_i then it covers F_i. Hence, if C does not cover any H_i then $|C| \geqslant mb \geqslant a + b$. There remains the case that C covers some H_i but does not cover some H_j. In this case by Observation 2.1 $|C \cap H_i| \geqslant a$. Since also $|C \cap F_j| \geqslant b$, we have $|C| \geqslant a + b$. □

Note that F as in the lemma exists - for example the collection of all b-subsets of $[2b - 1]$. Hence each part of the next lemma follows by combining Lemma 2.3 with the corresponding part of Lemma 2.2:

Lemma 2.4. *Let $b < a$ be integers. If either*

(1) *$\frac{a}{2} \leqslant b$, or:*
(2) *$a = p^s$ for some prime p and integer s*

then $t(a, b) = a + b$.

Lemma 2.5. *If $k < b$ and both (a, b) and $(b - k, k)$ satisfy either (1) or (2) then $t(a, b - k, k) = a + b$.*

Proof. The assumption that $(b - k, k)$ satisfies either (1) or (2) implies by Lemma 2.4 that there exists an intersecting $(b - k, k)$-partitioned b-graph G, with $\tau(G) = b$. Putting $F = G$ in Lemma 2.3 yields the present lemma. □

We now combine the results of Lemmas 2.4 and 2.5 to prove Theorem 1.2.

Proof. As before, we shall assume that $b < a$. The only pair (a, b) with $b < a \leqslant 8$ that does not satisfy either condition in Lemma 2.4 is $(a, b) = (6, 2)$. Since $(5, 3)$ and $(2, 1)$ both satisfy (1) of Lemma 2.4, by Lemma 2.5, $t(6, 2) = t(5, 2, 1) = 8$.

Thus, we may assume that $a > 8$ and $2b < a$. We proceed by induction on $a + b$. Then there exists a pair of numbers (u, v) satisfying
(i) $\frac{u}{2} \leqslant v < u < a$
(ii) $u + v = a + b$ and

(iii) $v \neq 2b$ (we shall use $v - b \neq b$).

Indeed, at least one of the pairs $(u,v) = \left(\left\lceil \frac{a+b+3}{2} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{a+b-3}{2} \right\rfloor\right)$ and $(u,v) = \left(\left\lceil \frac{a+b+1}{2} \right\rceil, \left\lfloor \frac{a+b-1}{2} \right\rfloor\right)$ satisfies all three conditions: the assumption that $a+b > 9$ implies (i) for both pairs, and (iii) is satisfied by at least one of these pairs. By the induction hypothesis $t(v-b,b) = v$, which by Lemma 2.5 implies that $t(u, v-b, b) = a+b$, which in turn implies that $t(u+v-b, b) = a+b$, namely $t(a,b) = a+b$. □

3. Other values of $\vec{a}$

3.1. An example showing $t(2,2) = 4$.

Example 3.1. Let $U = \{u_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_5\}$, $W = \{w_i : i \in \mathbb{Z}_5\}$, and arrange each of U and W in a pentagon. We construct a hypergraph H with 10 edges, $\nu = 1$ and $\tau = 4$, as follows. Five edges, $e_1, \ldots, e_5$, consist each of an edge in the U-pentagon and a diagonal parallel to it in the W-pentagon (so, say, $e_i = \{u_i, u_{i+1}, w_{i-1}, w_{i+2}\}$). The other five edges, $f_1, \ldots, f_5$, consist each of an edge of the W pentagon, and the parallel diagonal of the U-pentagon, shifted by 1 (so, say, $f_i = \{u_{i-1}, u_{i+1}, w_i, w_{i+1}\}$). Every two e_is meet, because a diagonal in W is disjoint only from the diagonals shifted $+1$ and -1 with respect to it, and then the corresponding parallel edges in W meet. The f_is meet for a similar reason. Each e_i meets each f_j because of the shifting. Thus $\nu(H) = 1$.

Assertion 3.2. $\tau(H) = 4$.

We have to show that any $S \subset V$ of size 3 is not a cover. If $S \subset U$ then it misses an edge of the complete graph on U, and hence by itself it is not a cover for H. Similarly, if $S \subset W$ then it is not a cover. Thus we may assume that (say) $|S \cap U| = 2$ and $|S \cap W| = 1$. Let E' be the set of edges that do not intersect $S \cap U$. There are distinct i, j such that $\{e_i, e_j\} \subset E'$ or $\{f_i, f_j\} \subset E'$.

For any i, j, $|e_i \cap e_j| = 1$. By the choice of the edges e_i, e_j this intersection point is in $U \backslash S$. Thus, $e_i \cap W$ and $e_j \cap W$ are disjoint, so S cannot cover both e_i and e_j. The argument is similar if $\{f_i, f_j\} \subset E'$. Thus S is not a cover, which completes the proof that $\tau(H) = 4$.

3.2. An example showing $t(2,2,2,2) = 8$.

Let T be the truncated 4-uniform projective plane (namely, the projective plane of order 3, with a vertex deleted). Then T is a 3-regular 4-partite hypergraph, with 9 edges and 12 vertices partitioned into parts of size 3. Denote its sides by V_1, V_2, V_3, V_4. For each $v \in V(T)$, let G_v be a copy of K_4. For each $f = (f_1, f_2, f_3, f_4) \in E(T)$ and each $v = f_i \in F$ choose arbitrarily a perfect matching $m(f,v) = \{m(f,v,0), m(f,v,1)\}$ in G_v. This can be done in such a way that for every $v \in V(T)$, denoting the three edges of T going through v by f, g, k, the three matchings $m(f,v), m(g,v), m(k,v)$ are distinct.

Let B be the set of all binary strings $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_1, \beta_2, \beta_3, \beta_4)$ such that $\beta_1 = 0$ if $\beta_3 = \beta_4$ and $\beta_1 = 1$ if $\beta_3 \neq \beta_4$. Clearly, $|B| = 8$. For every pair $(\beta, f) \in B \times E(T)$ let $h = h(\beta, f)$ be the set $\bigcup_{i \leqslant 4} \bigcup m(f, f_i, \beta_i)$. So, $\vec{\beta}$ decides for each i which of the two edges in the matching $m(f, f_i)$ is chosen by h. Let H be $\{h(\beta, f) \mid \beta \in B,\ f \in E(T)\}$. Clearly, H is $(2,2,2,2)$-partitioned, with sides $S_i = \bigcup_{v \in V_i} V(G_v)$ $(i = 1,2,3,4)$. It has 72 edges.

Assertion 3.3. $\nu(H) = 1$.

Proof. For any $\vec{\beta}$, $\vec{\gamma} \in B$, if $\beta_3 \neq \gamma_3$ and $\beta_4 \neq \gamma_4$, then $\beta_1 = \gamma_1$. Thus for any $f \in E(T)$ it is true that $h(f, \beta) \cap h(f, \gamma) \neq \emptyset$. Consider next two edges $h(\beta, f)$ and $h(\gamma, g)$ in H for $f \neq g$. By the intersection property of P, there exists a vertex $v \in f \cap g$, say $v = f_i = g_i$. By the construction $m(f,v) \neq m(g,v)$. Hence the two edges in S_i representing f and g in $h(\beta, f)$ and $h(\gamma, g)$ intersect. □

Assertion 3.4. $\tau(H) = 8$.

Proof. Assume for contradiction that there exists a cover C of size 7. For each edge e, fix a vertex $x_e \in C$ contained in e. For each e, any pair (y, e) where $y \in (C \cap e) \setminus \{x_e\}$ is said to constitute a *waste*. Since $\sum_{v \in C} deg_H(v) = 7 \times 12 = 84$ and $|E(H)| = 72$, we are allowed at most $84 - 72 = 12$ wastes.

Note that the common degree of two vertices belonging to different sides S_i is 2, while the common degree of two vertices belonging to the same G_v is 4. Suppose first that there exist two vertices in C that meet a side in distinct G_vs. Then all other vertices, apart from possibly one that may belong to the third copy of G_v in the same side, contributes at least 4 wastes, and thus the total number of wastes is more than 12. Thus we may assume that each side of H contains at most one G_v containing points from C. Fixing a vertex x, every other vertex contributes with x at least 2 wastes, while two vertices belonging to the same G_v (which must exist) contribute 4 wastes, so again there are more than 12 wastes. □

Corollary 3.5. $t(4,4) = 8$.

The first value of the function t that is not settled is $t(3,3)$.

Acknowledgement We are grateful to Aart Blokhuis for useful information.

References

[1] A. Abu-Khazne and Alexey Pokrovskiy, Intersecting extremal constructions in Ryser's Conjecture for r-partite hypergraphs, arXiv:1409.4938v1.
[2] R. Aharoni, Ryser's conjecture for tripartite 3-graphs, *Combinatorica* 21 (2001), no. 1, 1–4.
[3] R. Aharoni, J. Barát and I. Wanless, Multipartite hypergraphs achieving equality in Ryser's conjecture, arXiv:1409.4833v1
[4] A. E. Brouwer and A. Schrijver, The blocking number of an affine space, *J. Combin. Theory* Ser. A, 24 (1978) 251–253.
[5] Z. Füredi. Maximum degree and fractional matchings in uniform hypergraphs. *Combinatorica* **1** (1981), no. 2, 155–162.
[6] R. Jamison, Covering finite fields with cosets of subspaces, *J. Combin. Theory* Ser. A, 22 (1977) 253–266.
[7] D. König, Theorie der Endlichen und Unendlichen Graphen: Kombinatorische Topologie der Streckenkomplexe, Akad 1936.
[8] L. Lovász, On minimax theorems of combinatorics, Ph.D thesis, *Matemathikai Lapok* 26 (1975), 209–264 (in Hungarian).
[9] Zs. Tuza, Ryser's conjecture on transversals of r-partite hypergraphs, *Ars Combinatoria* 16(B) (1983), 201–209.

Department of Mathematics, Technion
E-mail address, Ron Aharoni: raharoni@gmail.com

Department of Mathematics, University of Chicago
E-mail address, C.J. Argue: cjargue@gmail.com